



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,241	01/23/2004	Chien-Jen Chang	14675-013001	8037
26161	7590	04/16/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC			NADKARNI, SARVESH J	
P.O. BOX 1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			2629	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/764,241	Applicant(s) CHANG, CHIEN-JEN
	Examiner SARVESH J. NADKARNI	Art Unit 2629
–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –		
THE REPLY FILED 02/22/2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>		
<p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p>_____</p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u></p>		
<p>/Amare Mengistu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629</p>		

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding the Remarks of the Amendment in Reply to Final Action dated December 5, 2007, Applicant argues, with respect to claim 1, 8, and 17 "none of Mori and Hong teaches, discloses or suggests 'classifying the brightness data into a predetermined brightness group, selecting a gamma signal from the group of predetermined gamma signals according to the brightness data, and providing the gamma signal to the data driver.'" Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is obvious from the combination of the teachings of Mori in view of Hong "classifying the brightness data into predetermined brightness groups" is taught by Mori (see Mori at least at paragraphs [0042]-[0044] describing light emission brightness of the display panel based on mean brightness, a method of classification of brightness data). Furthermore, the combination of Mori in view of Hong clearly teaches "selecting a gamma signal from the group of predetermined gamma signals according to the brightness data" (see Hong at least at paragraph [0045]-[0047] describing switching/selecting and further describing gamma signal based on brightness data at least at paragraphs [0039]-[0042] describing method of signal selection). Finally Mori in view of Hong clearly teaches "providing the gamma signal to the data driver" (see Mori at least at paragraph [0040] describing S10 having corrected gamma data processing). Therefore, the rejection as applied to claims 1, 8 and 17 stands.

With regard to claims 17 and 19, Applicant argues "none of Mori and Hong teaches, discloses or suggests that the brightness data is detected by sampling several frames." Examiner respectfully submits that Mori clearly teaches the use of multiple frames when brightness data is detected and calculated (see at least page 8, claim 5 and see additionally further described at least at page 5 paragraph [0076] describing detection of at least 2 frames which constitute 'several'). Therefore, the rejection stands as submitted.